



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/524,091

03/13/2000

Jennie Ching

BOC919990065US1

6651

63675

7590

11/26/2008

PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, LLP/IBM SVL
3040 POST OAK BLVD.
SUITE 1500
HOUSTON, TX 77056-6582

EXAMINER

PENG, FRED H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2426

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

11/26/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/524,091	Applicant(s) CHING ET AL.	
	Examiner FRED PENG	Art Unit 2426	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 September 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 21-26, 41, 43, 44 and 46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 21-26, 41, 43, 44 and 46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2426

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 09/02/2008 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed on 09/02/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues on page 11 of Remarks dated on 09/02/2008 that there is nothing disclosed or suggested in the advisory action references about program feeds and local spots, nor using such a time period requirement for the scheduled playout of local spots in a program feed system as recited in claim 21. Local spots are not analogous to frames or packets in the context of claim 21, since frames or packets are basic, essential units of network information based on a used network protocol and used with all transmitted information regardless of content or type, while a local spot is an amount of data organized and based on the type of content of the data. One of ordinary skill reading the advisory action references might add a predetermined time interval for frames or packets used in the network protocol-level operation of all information sent in a program feed system (if applicable), but such a person would not add a time period requirement relating to the scheduled playout of a local spot as recited in claim 21, since the advisory action references do not disclose or suggest such a feature.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with applicant's arguments. Although Bux (US 5,319,648) from the advisory references only teach about packet/frame level protocol; however, this known method would have prompted one of ordinary skill in the art to implement a variations of this method and produce a predictable results such as higher level application of local advertisement, comprising multiple of I-frames transmission, as taught by Boylan in view of

Art Unit: 2426

McCoy (teaches program feed, multimedia clips and associated control parameters such as telecast time) and Esch (teaches switching between program feed and local spot).

The Applicant further argues that the cited reference do not disclose or suggest control parameters that specify requirements for availability of the local advertisements on the central site server to the one or more remote servers to allow playout of the local spots as recited in Claim 21.

The Examiner also disagrees with applicant's arguments. McCoy teaches control parameters for a program telecast schedule including promotion program such as local ad (FIG.19; Col 4 lines 33-44); Boylan further discloses a local advertisement can be transmitted from a central site server (FIG.7; FIG.10). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have multiple options to include local advertisements from a remote source to accommodate the scheduled local ad broadcasting.

Bux further discloses a given time interval is required for reporting to the sending station for retransmission of missing I-frames of transmitted program (Col 4 lines 3-9). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add a time window in the schedule for program availability to provide an additional cushion for a smooth transition for a program broadcast.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,526,575 to McCoy et al. (McCoy) in view of U.S. Patent 5,099,319 to Esch et al. (Esch), U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0166120 to Boylan, III et al. (Boylan), and Bux et al (US 5,319,648).

Regarding claim 21, McCoy teaches prior to the playout of the program feed, distributing a plurality of multimedia sports from a central site server to one or more remote site servers located at one or more corresponding remote sites relative to the central control site (fig. 1, col. 5-6, ll.41-8). Whereas McCoy teaches multimedia clips, McCoy is silent on distributing a local spots from a central site server to one or more remote site servers.

In analogous art, Boylan teaches distributing local advertisements for different regions from a central site to remote sites (see fig. 7, pg. 5, Para. 0061).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify McCoy by distributing a local spots from a central site server to one or more remote site servers as taught by Boylan in order to provide local advertisements to different regions and reduce the processing at the downlink facility.

McCoy teaches sending a plurality of control parameters from the central server to each of the one or more remote servers (fig. 18-19, col. 4, ll.33-51, col. 16, ll. 41-52). McCoy teaches transmitting the program feed from the central server to remote sites (col. 19, ll. 41-62), and each of the remote sites automatically switching between the playout of the program feed and playout of the multimedia content in accordance with the plurality of parameters received (col. 20, ll. 33-43). McCoy teaches control parameter specifying requirements for availability of the national spots on the central site server to the one or more remote servers to allow playout of the national ads (FIG.19, 618) but not explicitly about local spots.

Boylan shows that local spots can be part of distribution from central facility to remote facility to reduce the processing at the downlink facility.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Boylan by distributing a local spots from a central site server to one or more remote site servers with parameter specifying requirements for availability as taught by McCoy in order to provide local advertisements to different regions using the control information in order to better inform and entertain viewers (Abstract).

Art Unit: 2426

McCoy and Boylan are silent about the control parameters including a playtime look ahead window parameter that sets a time period requirement before the scheduled play out of a local spot at which time each of the remote site servers checks to report to the central server a local spot missing at the remote site server.

In an analogous art, Bux discloses a receiving station to report missing I-frames of a video data transmission during a given time period in order to retransmit from the transmission station (Col 1 lines 25-31; Col 4 lines 3-9).

Therefore, the design incentive of solving the problem of reporting the missing local spot within a time period would have prompted one of ordinary skill in the art to implement a predictable variation of the prior art system of Bux to apply the known principle of protocol, reporting missing data within a certain period of time, to a known higher level applications such as local advertisements.

McCoy is silent on the switching between the program feed and local spot.

In analogous art, Esch teaches switching between the program feed and local spot (col. 8, ll. 35-62).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify McCoy by switching between the program feed and local spot as taught by Esch in order to provide the local advertisements to the desired viewers, thereby increasing the effectiveness of the advertisements.

Regarding claim 22, McCoy teaches the program feed received by from the uplink facility, which reads on a network feed, but is silent on a local spot comprising local advertising or a local announcement. In analogous art, Esch teaches the local spot as advertisements (col. 3, ll. 20-35). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify McCoy by using local advertisements as taught by Esch in order to effectively display pertinent information to viewers.

Art Unit: 2426

5. Claims 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,526,575 to McCoy et al. (McCoy), U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0166120 to Boylan, III et al. (Boylan), U.S. Patent 5,099,319 to Esch et al. (Esch), Bux et al (US 5,319,648) in view of Plotnick et al (US 2008/0059997).

Regarding claims 23 and 24, McCoy teaches the central server in communication with the remote site server through a plurality of types of network links (FIG.1, 104, 116; col. 6, II. 9-14), wherein the program feed is transmitted via one type of network link (104, satellite link).

McCoy discloses telephone land line (terrestrial link) as alternate network link but is not explicitly about distributing the local spots via the alternate link.

In an analogous art, Plotnick discloses transmitting a local ad from a server based on the bandwidth availability of a transmission media (Para 142 lines 14-17).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify McCoy so local ads can be transmitted via an alternate transmission link to better manage the overall bandwidth usage.

6. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,526,575 to McCoy et al. (McCoy), U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0166120 to Boylan, III et al. (Boylan), U.S. Patent 5,099,319 to Esch et al. (Esch) and Bux et al (US 5,319,648) in view of U.S. Patent 5,920,700 to Gordon et al. (Gordon).

Regarding claim 25, McCoy teaches a plurality of control parameters including uplink parameters, schedule parameters (col. 4, I1.9~35, col. 4, II. 44-51, col. 9, II. 24-35, col. 10, II. 25-60, and col. 12, II. 19-30). However, McCoy is silent on teaching a storage parameters controlling the distribution of data to be received.

In analogous art, Gordon teaches storage parameters for controlling the distribution of assets (col. 5, I1.45-61).

Art Unit: 2426

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify McCoy by controlling the distribution of data to be received as taught by Gordon in order to save disk space and network bandwidth by copying or deleting assets based on their usage and priority.

7. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,526,575 to McCoy et al. (McCoy), U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0166120 to Boylan, III et al. (Boylan), U.S. Patent 5,099,319 to Esch et al. (Esch), Bux et al (US 5,319,648) and U.S. Patent 5,920,700 to Gordon et al. (Gordon), in view of U.S. Patent 6,253,079 to Valentine et al. (Valentine).

Regarding claim 26, McCoy teaches schedules of multimedia insertions (see fig. 19), which reads on a scheduler parameter including a playlist transmission lookahead. The combination of McCoy and Gordon has been discussed above; Gordon teaches a storage parameter including playlist entries (col. 5, ll. 45-61).

McCoy, Bux, and Gordon are silent on uplink parameters including one or more of an uplink broadcast transmission, an uplink forward, or an uplink look-ahead.

In analogous art, Valentine teaches retransmitting data when the threshold of the capacity of the satellite is exceeded (col. 5, ll. 9L26, col. 5, ll. 34-67), which reads on an uplink broadcast transmission.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify McCoy, Bux, and Gordon by an uplink parameter including an uplink broadcast transmission as taught by Valentine in order to share resources on a satellite in a fair manner to prevent overloading the capacity.

8. Claims 41, 43 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,526,575 to McCoy et al. (McCoy), Bux et al (US 5,319,648), U.S. Patent Application Publication

Art Unit: 2426

2002/0166120 to Boylan, III et al. (Boylan), U.S. Patent 5,099,319 to Esch et al. (Esch) in view of Nakamura et al (US 5,913,039).

Regarding claims 41 and 44, Nakamura discloses video reproduction is not delayed due to the time needed for locating the start of each data stream of the title of the transmission request (Col 4 lines 40-44) and consequently suggesting the video content must be staged on the server to be ready for reception without delay.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a time window limit parameter prior to a scheduled playout of each of the local spots as taught by Nakamura to better synchronize two separate streams.

Regarding claim 43, Nakamura discloses video reproduction is not delayed due to the time needed for locating the start of each data stream of the title of the transmission request (Col 4 lines 40-44). The Official Notice is also taken that it is well known in the art that there is a transit time needed for a RF signal transmission; In subsequence, the local spot is considered to be dead when there is not enough time to transmit before the scheduled time.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to indicate a minimum transit time needed to transmit a particular local spot prior to a scheduled playout to better synchronize two separate streams.

9. Claim 46 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,526,575 to McCoy et al. (McCoy), Bux et al (US 5,319,648), U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0166120 to Boylan, III et al. (Boylan), U.S. Patent 5,099,319 to Esch et al. (Esch) in view of Tsuda (US 5,345,594).

Regarding claim 46, McCoy and Boylan are silent about the control parameters including a stage manager look ahead parameter that specifies a look ahead time to retrieve a queue table

Art Unit: 2426

indicating a queue of spots to be staged, wherein the look ahead time is used in a determination of which of the local spots should be staged for transmission.

In an analogous art, Tsuda teaches transmission of a schedule of video data from a base station to a relay station for video retransmission (col. 1, lines 37-60).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify McCoy and Boylan to include a schedule of video data from a base station to a relay station for video retransmission as taught by Tsuda with added benefits of effecting a time base expanding process to the retrieved information signal (Col 2 lines 5-8).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to FRED PENG whose telephone number is (571)270-1147. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 09:00-18:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vivek Srivastava can be reached on (571) 272-7304. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Fred Peng
Patent Examiner

Vivek Srivastava
Supervisory Patent Examiner

Application/Control Number: 09/524,091

Page 10

Art Unit: 2426

/Vivek Srivastava/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2426